

*Business of the House*

Also while he is on his feet would he be so kind as to table the document from which he was quoting.

**Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of State and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons):** Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I intend to begin second reading on Bill C-73 and we hope to carry on and complete second reading of that tomorrow.

In view of the necessity to deal with the plebiscite legislation in some order, to have this tool available, I would like to talk through the usual channels with the opposition parties concerning scheduling next week. I think that will affect everything else we are planning to do.

He asks about this document. It is a public document. Not only would I be willing to table it, I want to circulate it to everybody who can read. Had this document been read, we probably would have had quite a different Question Period over the last couple of days because it addresses all of the concerns that were raised by members opposite during that time.

Certainly I will table it and as I said, distribute it if I can.

**Mr. Dingwall:** Mr. Speaker, my final question is for the government House leader. In order that we might expedite and facilitate further discussion in the House both during Question Period and other times, at page 10627 of yesterday's *Hansard*, he indicated that at the committee stage the legal advice that the deputy leader of our party was seeking would be given.

In view of the co-operation that supposedly was extended to members of the opposition, would the government House leader not now entertain providing copies of the legal opinion, both that done by the PCO as well as outside legal counsel, concerning the charter provisions. Would he provide that advice and that information as well?

**Mr. Andre:** Mr. Speaker, in a sincere attempt, and I say this genuinely, to try and get some consensus on this legislation which is very important to those of us who want to keep the country united, I engaged in conversations with the hon. member and the House leader of the New Democratic Party on three different occasions. There were briefings provided to officials from the offices of the leaders of both parties.

It seems to me that instead of gaining co-operation, it provided fodder for Question Period and resulted in an escalation. This issue is becoming more partisan than

what I had in mind when, in fact, I departed from the usual practice of bills being presented to the House and coming as a surprise to the opposition without their having any input.

Now the hon. member is saying: "Please supply us with more fodder at this point in time". He will understand if I suggest that perhaps I made a mistake involving the opposition in consultations early on, I do want to take some of the steam out of this issue. It is hurting the country, hurting the integrity of the country and hurting what we are all trying to do in keeping the country together.

I assure the hon. member that as the bill proceeds he will be provided with the legal opinions. He also has my assurances should those legal opinions give him or anybody else in this House cause to suggest amendments that might put in place limits and so on of the kind we have been accustomed to, that the government would be very receptive to that. I also say at this point in time that is not a very high likelihood.

If he would have patience and agree with me that we are better off to treat this issue in a more non-partisan manner, we would be better serving the country to proceed in that way.

**Mr. Nelson A. Riis (Kamloops):** Mr. Speaker, I wish to pursue this issue with my hon. friend, the government House leader. I think he was saying that we could likely plan to proceed with debating the enabling legislation next week.

Would the government House leader consider the possibility at least of using Committee of the Whole as a way of dealing with this legislation as opposed to a legislative committee? I am just saying we should explore that as a possibility.

Was he saying that we would perhaps depart from the normal rule that any amendments put during committee have to be within the general parameters of the bill and cannot exceed the limits of the bill? When talking about some of these issues, whether it is spending rights or what he is suggesting, they would also obviously go beyond the scope of the bill. Could he clarify that, particularly in anticipation of what could be an amendment?

**Mr. Andre:** Mr. Speaker, in terms of how the bill might be treated in Committee of the Whole, absolutely. As I indicated in our conversations, that certainly has some attractions. It gives it the possibility for a broader